

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are pending herein. Claims 16-24 have been withdrawn from consideration.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 14 have been amended to more fully distinguish the invention of the claims over the teachings of the prior art references cited against these claims, and claims 5 and 6 are amended to avoid an antecedent basis issue regarding the gate electrode.

No new matter is added by this Amendment. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 5, 6 and 14 is found in the original specification, original claims, and Figures. In particular, support for the language added to claims 1 and 14 may be found in, for example, Fig. 12.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Roman in the September 29, 2003 interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

**I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,355,510 (hereinafter "Kim") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,171,913 (hereinafter "Wang"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kim discloses a well-known method for manufacturing thin-film transistors (TFT) but fails to disclose all the elements recited in the claims. Wang merely discloses a common method for making a MOS transistor, but fails to describe any manufacturing method for TFTs.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, nothing in Kim or Wang, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests a gate insulating film formed over and entirely covering the channel, the source and the drain regions, as recited in claims 1 and 14.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Kim and Wang, whether taken singularly or in combination, would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to the invention of independent claims 1 and 14 and any of depending claims 2-13 and 15. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are thus respectfully requested.

## **II. Rejoinder**

Applicant notes that non-elected claims 16-24 are directed to a thin film transistor device, while elected claims 1-15 are directed to a method of manufacturing a thin-film transistor. The Patent Office alleged, in the Restriction Requirement (part of paper no. 11), that the original invention method could be used to manufacture a different and patentable distinct semiconductor device from the device claimed in claims 16-24, and thus, withdrew claims 16-24 from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

When making a restriction requirement based on claims related as method of making and device made the Patent Office must identify another and materially different method for making the claimed device, or must identify another and materially different device that can be made when performing the claimed method for manufacture.

To be another and materially different device made, the asserted device cannot be within the scope of the claim for the device made, and must be made by the method for manufacture. If either of these requirements is not met, the grounds for requiring restriction are improper.

Here, the device claimed, a TFT, is a semiconductor device. The Patent Office has not demonstrated that a semiconductor device is another materially different device made by the method of manufacture of claims 1-15. As the asserted device is within the scope of the claim for the device made, the grounds for requiring restriction are improper.


For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the restriction requirement is improper. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are thus respectfully requested.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claim 1-24 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel  
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/rav

Date: October 14, 2003

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---